DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 213 270 FL 012 822

TITLE Keynote Address and Background Papers. National Assembly on Foreign Language and International Studies (Racine, Wisconsin, October 30-November 1, 1980).

INSTITUTION Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE 80

NOTE 46p.; For related document, see FL 012 568.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; *College Role; Curriculum Development; Educational Needs; Ethnic Studies; Faculty Development; Federal Government; *Global Approach; Higher Education; Institutional Cooperation; *International Studies; Multicultural Education; Program Development; *Second Language Instruction

ABSTRACT

The conference papers presented here discuss the need for and means of implementing changes in educational design and emphasis that will recognize the need for Americans to incorporate foreign language and international studies into their education. In addition to the opening address by Richard Berendzen, the following papers are included: (1) "Developments and Prospects Following the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies" by Sven Groennings; (2) ''Foreign Language Teaching" by Richard Brod and Peter Eddy (discusses college foreign language requirements, secondary-higher education coordination, linguistics and language teaching, and cooperation between bilingual and foreign language educators); (3) "Curriculum Development in International Studies" by James E. Harf; (4) "Interinstitutional Cooperation: An Avenue to the World" by Werner Prange; (4) "Faculty and Program Development in Foreign Languages" by Guy Stern; and (5) "Multicultural Education, Bilingual Education and Ethnic Studies: Implications for Foreign Language and International Studies" by Carlos E. Cortes. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED213270

National Assembly on Foreign Language and International Studies

Keynote Address and Background Papers

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Association of American Colleges

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Wingspread Conference Center
Racine, Wisconsin

October 30 - November 1, 1980

2

FL 012 822

aac Association of American Colleges

Cooperating Associations

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
American Association of State Colleges and Universities
American Council on Education
Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities
Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities
Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges
Institute of International Education
Modern Language Association of America
National Association of State Universities
and Land-Grant Colleges

with assistance from

Exxon Education Foundation
National Endowment for the Humanities

in cooperation with

The Johnson Foundation

Copies of the report of the National Assembly, **Toward Education with a Global Perspective** are available from the Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, NW, Washington, DC 20009.

Piece of Debris Number Three

Keynote Address
Richard Berendzen
President
The American University

> And the whole earth was of one language, and of one speech... And the Lord said, Behold, the people is one, and they all have one language...Let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech.
>
> So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth; and they left off to build the city.
>
> Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the Lord did there confound the language of all the earth; and from thence did the Lord scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth.
>
> --Genesis 11:1-9

Who said our problems have come only during the last decade?

To such distinguished specialists, who have come from across the nation to devote the next days to matters of grave concern, I need not explain the reasons for our mutual anguish. And if anyone should question the need for such a meeting as this, he need look no further than the Perkins Commission Report or the May-June issue of Change magazine. The former--entitled "Strength Through Wisdom"--documents our current sad situation nationally in understanding foreign languages and in pursuing international studies and proffers a disparate array of solutions. The latter--entitled "Educating for the World View"--reinforces those findings and provides additional proposals for solving them. In addition, several of you already have prepared thoughtful manuscripts to help guide this assembly. And your collective task during the next 72 hours will be to review the Perkins Report in detail and to arrive at specific recommendations, ones commensurate with the problems, appropriate to our times, and realistic for our resources.

Now, of course, I already have all of the problems solved! But it would be extremely rude of me to deprive you of the joy of a Wingspread Conference by shortening your stay through disclosing the answers now. So, instead, I shall focus on a few specific matters:

First, what, exactly are the problems we are so concerned about, and how did they arise?

Presumably, we are here because of intense concern over the national dearth of foreign language instruction and international studies. But perhaps we should define our terms more precisely.

Which foreign language should our students be learning better? How about one that seems strangely foreign to a staggeringly large fraction of them--namely, English! In our effort to discover the world, we may even find ourselves.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, a topsy-turvy anomaly arose. The people with the least formal training and experience--namely, the youth--were presumed to

possess some special, virginal wisdom, which the more corrupted adult world had long since lost. And so, instead of youth learning from its elders, as has been traditional throughout the millennia, the older, presumably more mature population emulated, not the best and the brightest, but the youngest and the brashest. Jargon of the youth became rhetoric of the establishment. The nervous, adolescent, ubiquitous staccato of "you know" became the paradigm of our articulation. And technology introduced wondrous new terms to our vocabulary--"input," "point in time," "interface," and "bottom line."

That our nation demonstrably lacks facility in foreign languages is clear, but that is but an echo of a larger problem. At root, we do not know the languages of other nations and cultures well because we do not know our own well. Goethe claimed that: "He who does not know another language, does not know his own." I would claim that: "He who does not know his own language, cannot hope to know another."

A second of our concerns is the national failing to study other countries and cultures. Again, however, before we can comprehend the world, we must comprehend ourselves. It is true, regrettably, that a high fraction of our nation's school children fail to score well when asked even rudimentary questions about other countries. But it is equally true that they score deplorably on comparable tests about their own nation. Many of our high school students think Anwar Sadat is the President of Israel. And many of our high school students do not know the names of their own U.S. Senators, or of the Chief Justice of the United States, or of the Vice President of the United States, or even of the President of the United States two terms ago.

As George Will once put it, "many of our students have taken courses in which they learn body language but not the location of Europe."

In short, the dual problems we consider here at Wingspread--foreign languages and international studies--are but microcosms of a larger national educational malaise.

Tennyson wrote, "what you are speaks so loudly that I can scarcely hear what you say." What we are, as a nation, is the most complex, heterogeneous society with the most sophisticated and accomplished higher educational system in the world's history. Yet, even though the successes of that system have been truly Olympian--from innovative teaching to pioneering research, from universal access to pedagogical diversity--we, of late, also have had anguishing problems and staggering failures.

One of the most ancient of Chinese proverbs states: "The beginning of wisdom is to call things by their right names." So, then, let us have the courage to do so now:

--The right name for much of what passes as certified education is "mediocre."

--The right name for much of what passes as a qualified teacher is "unprepared" or "incompetent."

--The right name for many of our high schools, especially those in urban centers, is not "citadels of learning" but "cauldrons of violence."

--The right name for much of our recent national educational ethos is not "inviolate preservation of academic rigor" but "pragmatic diminution of quality.

Certainly, too few of our young people know enough about foreign languages and foreign studies. And, certainly, too few of them know well their own native tongue and about their own native land. Worse yet, measure after measure indicates the same sad finding--not only a failure to comprehend facts and theories but also inadequacies in basic skills and appreciation of organized thought and intellectual discipline.

Make no mistake about it: before the nation can solve the core problems about which this Assembly is concerned, even more cardinal ones must be resolved.

Schools and colleges alike must restore language requirements. And they must restore science requirements, rigorous grading, and a host of other matters, while simultaneously asserting forthrightly that some ideas are simply superior to others. A key role of educators is to guide and direct the student in the total educational program, as well as in the classroom itself. Educators even must have the courage to tell a student when he or she is failing. Some people argue that it is cruel and harsh and psychologically damaging to hold a student back at the 4th grade level. I say it is cruel and harsh and psychologically damaging--to the student and to society alike--to permit him to graduate from the 12th grade, with the imprimatur of the school, and yet be a functional illiterate.

But at the outset I also asked when did our problems begin? How did our travail become so great?

"The trouble with our times," the French poet Paul Valery observes, "is that the future is not what it used to be." Nor, might he add, was the past as glorious as we like to remember; neither, however, was it always without merit. The traumatic events of the 1960s and early 1970s --civil rights, Vietnam, Watergate, the energy crisis, and many more--led to numerous educational and social changes, both good and ill. Out have gone truly irrelevant curricula, but also out has gone much of civilized thought. Out have gone oppressive requirements, but also out has gone much of the richness of a liberal and liberating education.

And as our problems abroad seemed ever to worsen during the late 1960's, the youth, the professoriate, and even the nation became more introspective. There is nothing wrong with critical self-examination; indeed, the painful path to one's own self is a road too few travel. But we became too myopic, too parochial; and never has this been more dangerous than today.

Our modern world can be mercurial and bewildering. In a matter of days, an ally can become an enemy, an enemy an ally. Undreamt possibilities live alongside unspeakable deprivation. Populations expand; resources diminsh. Expectations rise; benefits fall. Never before has the world had the opportunity to achieve so much or to perish so quickly. So, then, what is our hope? Years ago, H.G. Wells put it precisely: "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe."

Yet, our national problems are more basic still. A blunt fact stands: by many measures, we have lost our resolve. We demand little of ourselves and accept the result. Our productivity slips. Our work effort plummets.

What is needed--not only in higher education but in all of education, not only in education but in all of American life--is a rededication to personal, institutional and even national sense of pride. When professions become only jobs, when mediocrity replaces meritocracy, when today towers over tomorrow, then gradually, inexorably, the foundation for self-respect deteriorates.

"What you are speaks so loudly," Tennyson wrote, "that I can scarcely hear what you say." Indeed!

What we say is that we are massively concerned about foreign languages and international studies. But what we are--from kindergarten to high school, from television to teaching aids, from university admissions requirements to the curriculum itself--speaks so loudly that our platitudes are muffled in the din.

But aside from the generic, let us turn specifically to the two key issues at hand.

1. First, languages. In the early 19th century, John Lubbock asserted: "The English tongue bids fair to become the general language of the human race." In 1919, just two days before his death, Theodore Roosevelt gave not only an eloquent statement for patriotism but also a revealing indication of the American mind-set: "We have room in this country for but one flag, the stars and stripes... We have room but for one loyalty, loyalty to the United States...And we have room for but one language, the English language." And in 1926, Edward Lucas summed it up well: "Americans prefer the continent to their own country, but they refuse to learn its languages."

Of course, it must be conceded that many arguments of the past in favor of foreign language instruction have withstood neither careful scrutiny nor withering wear of time. For instance, it used to be nearly common creed that to understand English properly, one first must learn Latin. And so it was that I personally studied Latin. Today, I do not remember the ablative so well as the drill. And the only sentence I still can say in Latin is, Ego amo te. A lovely expression, but it comes up rarely in everyday parlance! And presumably, once a language is learned well, it always will come back to you with only a little practice, somewhat like bicycle riding. Perhaps, but I now woefully find that, from lack of use, both my German and my bike riding are wobbly.

Insofar as the world has a universal language, it is not Esperanto; it is English. From Athens to Jakarta, from Rio to Delhi, English, like the U.S. dollar, has become the universal standard. (Except, of course, in Paris, where monolinguistic Americans have been said to starve in bistros, trying pathetically to communicate.)

Nonetheless, Samuel Johnson was right: "Languages are the pedigrees of nations." And if we are to understand other nations, we simply must understand their languages.

The universality and power of English cannot be denied; nor, however, should it be overstated. Although English is understood by a substantial fraction of the world's educated populace, it is the first language of only a minute fraction of the total world community. To function in a polylingual world, we must meet other peoples on their own terms. And that clearly means foreign language instruction.

2. As for international studies, who would be so chauvinistic as to argue that global education is not desirable? But many things seem desirable; and, for whatever reason, schools become the presumed transmitters of this desired information--from physical education to driver education. If international studies are to be included, what is to be excluded. And how, exactly, are we to go about international education?

In biology, you do not merely theorize over the internal workings of a frog; you dissect one. In astronomy, you do not merely calculate the stars; you photograph them, analyse them. Can we, figuratively, dissect a country? And if we can not yet travel to the stars, can we at least travel to foreign countries, if not physically, then by means of appropriate teaching aids?

Over two centuries ago, the Earl of Chesterfield claimed that, "knowledge of the world is only to be acquired in the world." But before we set out on such a trek, it might be prudent for us to define the world we presume to understand.

In my time as a student, when we reportedly had international studies superior to today's, we were required to take courses in "Western Civilization." One of my most indelible school-day memories is of my world history textbook--thick as a big-city telephone directory--which contained but one chapter on the non-Western world. To my total bafflement, then and now, the teacher skipped even that lonely chapter!

And so my own formal exposure to international studies was confined to a cliche-ridden synopsis of Western Europe. Meanwhile, the history, art, religion, politics, aspirations, achievements of the overwhelming bulk of the world's population never once entered the compass of my pristine education, to disturb my well-formed Western traditions and beliefs. Now, we have a generation who learn less, still. And we wonder sometimes why it is that our policy makers and diplomats, our journalists and business leaders fail to understand the third world and the second, the southern hemisphere and the northern.

So, then, let me state this clearly: our educational system--indeed, our nation itself--needs a major rethinking. Such national urgency sometimes propels us mindlessly, confusing motion with progress. But in education, like in the nation itself, we need moderation and balance.

--Not "back to basics," but forward to proper curricula for today.

--Not rejection of liberal arts or obsession with professional training, but education for both a life and a living.

--Not reintroduction of rote memorization of foreign languages or cursory surveys of Western Civilization, but genuine immersion in foreign languages and cultures--Western and Eastern, northern and southern, rich and poor, familiar and unfamiliar.

Before proceeding through the labyrinth of questions before us at this Assembly, some initial, buiding principles should be enunicated, examined, and accepted or rejected. Among them are the following:

(A) The American educational system at all levels must be grounded upon certain basic skills, the most fundamental of which is language, and the language most critical to us is English. Therefore, the bedrock upon which all understanding in the American educational system must be founded is a thorough, comprehensive facility with English. Concomitantly, competence in at least rudimentary mathematical skills is essential. Some of the basic themes of the earliest school days must include a thorough grounding in English and mathematics, as well as development of self-discipline, learning how to learn, and, most importantly, learning the desirability of learning.

(B) With this as a fundamental foundation, the early teenage years can properly be used as a time for a student's self discovery of personal interests and talents. Therein comes initial recognition of professional careers. Although such

career orientation is desirable, it must not become exclusionary, diminishing other vital parts of the educational wnole. In particular, the young student--ideally, the younger the better--should be introduced to foreign languages. And as soon as the student has a basic understanding of his own culture, he should be exposed to a diversity of foreign ones. By the end of the 12th grade level, virtually all students, except possibly those in strictly vocational programs, should have been required to have had at least some instruction in foreign languages and some introduction to international studies, including non-Western cultures.

(C) To achieve this real world nirvana, the schools will require substantial support, not only from school boards and taxpayers but also from professors of languages and international studies and from colleges of education. (In the latter regard, though, we must be cautious. In few areas of academe have we failed more pitifully than in our colleges of education. Too often, in them, the mediocre teach the inept. And with over-emphasis on pedagogy at the expense of academic subject matter, colleges of education often produce graduates with stunning grade point averages who are ill-informed and unprepared.) In addition, such otherwise positive social changes as the women's movement can worsen a bad situation. As more professional fields that heretofore largely have been closed to women open, as they rightly should--such as law, medicine, and business--the pool of available talent for well-qualified teachers will drop further. This already has happened in nursing and it undoubtedly will happen in education, too.

And exacerbating these difficulties, many conventional segments of society no longer provide the extracurricular instruction and guidance that young persons vitally need, and the schools increasingly have been expected to assume those burdens. Make no mistake about it: the school teacher and the school administrator cannot be all things to all people--educator, disciplinarian, friend, supervisor, counsellor, police officer, and even parent. The public schools need help--from the U.S. Department of Education, from state and local school systems, from PTA's, and most importantly, from parents themselves. And they need help from us, too.

Our colleges of education and our entire universities must work closely with the secondary and elementary sectors, to assist current teachers and to prepare well-qualitied future ones. Without this partnership, all else will be meaningless. Guidelines and suggestions, textbooks and teaching aids, films and video tapes will be of value only insofar as teachers themselves are inspired to use them, and do use them.

(D) As part of the current reexamination of our undergraduate curricula, most institutions of higher learning need to consider possible reintroduction of language requirements, for both exit from their institutions and entrance into them. Whereas a generation ago approximately 35% of the American colleges and universities required foreign language proficiency for admission, today only 8% do so. And if institutions of higher learning do not require it, why should the secondary schools? But institutions of higher learning should not require it merely to appear rigorous; rather, they must ask themselves seriously how the study of foreign languages will fit as an integral component of their educational programs and mission.

To put the matter squarely in modern terms, will foreign language instruction and international studies appeal to the consumer? Of late, the economy has changed many students' motivations. The humble learner and fledgling scholar have

given way to the questioning consumer and future job-seeker. And many students have come not for education but for certification.

Therein lies one of the gravest dangers to liberal learning in general and to global education in particular. In its most deliciously cynical form, the mandate of "relevance" has been put thusly: "The only value of a classical brain is that it will enable you to despise the wealth it will prevent you from obtaining."

But we need not retreat or apologize, for global education is relevant, not just for entry into work but for continuance of life. For the citizen of the 21st century, global education will be the apotheosis of relevance; it will be indispensible.

Yet, even these matters are not the central issue, the one we all avoid, because we do not know how to answer it. Walter Lippmann encapsulated it almost four decades ago: "We have established a system of education in which we insist that everyone must be educated, yet there is nothing in particular that we think an educated person should know."

Probably all of us here would agree that foreign language instruction is worthwhile. But how about the foreign, exotic language called "mathematics." In our increasingly technological world, should the study of computers be mandatory, if not in high schools then at least in universities? And if study of the world--that is, its peoples--is desirable, how about the study of the earth itself?

We simply do not know what an educated person should know. And in terms of teaching-time and available resources, it is a zero sum. Or is it? Might economics be taught globally, comparatively? And likewise with government and literature, philosophy and art, even business and law? Still, what is the right mix for an educated undergraduate? And does it even matter so much what specifically we do teach? The real role of education is not to be comprehensive but rather to open vistas, spark curiosity, develop an ethos; to encourage the student never to graduate, always to keep studying.

Einstein said, "education is what's left after you've forgotten everything you learned in school." Not a bad operational definition. With it in mind, what do we want in our undergraduate curricula? Breadth and prescription; to know at least one subject well, while at least appreciating the value of many others.

In my judgment, an essential ingredient for undergraduate education today is not so much study of foreign languages as it is understanding of a global community. To do that well, of course, one should understand foreign languages. But of at least equal importance, one also should understand the people themselves. And that means a great deal more than merely their political systems. In times past, international studies often focused almost exclusively on political affairs. Even though such matters are clearly important, so too are the traditions and history and religion and belief systems of other peoples.

Likewise, it is worth discovering that some fine old ideas can become new again. The classic concept of "junior year abroad," had great merit in its day, and it does now as well. Even as we watch our conventional college-age population plummet down the demographic rollercoaster of the 1980's, we must have the integrity to advise our students about the extraordinary educational worth to be gained by study abroad, if not for an entire year, then at least for a summer. And we should

not leave students to themselves to facilitate such arrangements; instead, our universities should establish programs, whereby students can pursue, without loss of credit or time, key components of their regular programs at accredited, rigorous foreign universities.

And I hope the point would be self-evident to student and parent alike that the principal learning from such an experience would not take place in the classroom but in the total living environment. The student may well learn as much from his landlord as from his professor and as much in the market as in the library.

(E) To facilitate all this, those of us in administrative positions in higher education must attempt to remove natural barriers:

--The reluctance of faculty members to change undergraduate distribution requirements, fearing loss of enrollments in certain departments.

--Some faculty members' lack of preparation to teach courses with an international or global perspective.

With rising costs, declining demographics, increasing litigation, dwindling resources, how could we possibly hope to take on yet another educational challenge? Because we must. The concepts here are not educational niceties; they may underpin the survival of the Republic. In short, we have no choice. Ideally, with financial support--from foundations and corporations, from the state governments and the federal government--we will be able to re-train faculty, develop new teaching materials, assist current elementary and secondary teachers, fund study abroad programs, and meet other needed strategies. But with or without such monies, we must get on with the task.

(F) And while we focus our view outward on the world, we must not forget that the world constantly looks inward at us. Specifically, increasingly large numbers of students are studying abroad--namely, students from around the world now come here for their education; the "junior year abroad" is no longer so much the Kentuckian in Paris as the Kuwaiti in Houston. With improving economies in many developing countries, with devaluation of the American dollar, and with our world-renowned educational system has come a dramatic phenomenon--over 300,000 foreign students who are now pursuing studies in the United States. Some projections suggest that by the end of this decade that number may reach 3/4 of a million or more. And as our own 18-22 year old population decreases in number, the percentage standing of foreign students in our universities and colleges will become higher still. Moreover, the altruism of global education is being reinforced by the pragmatism of full classrooms and balanced budgets. Thus, international education involves a two-way flow of peoples. It is an idea whose time definitely has come.

With these hundreds of thousands of foreign visitors come unique responsibilities and unique opportunities. You all are familiar with the Perkins Commission of a year ago; you may be less familiar with the newly formed National Committee on Foreign Student Policy of the Mellon Foundation and the American Council on Education. I have the pleasure of chairing it. The Committee's final report will be issued at the ACE annual meeting in October, 1981.

Although the principal concerns of that Committee are on the responsibilities and opportunities attendant with foreign students studying in the United States, it should be noted at this Assembly that those foreign visitors provide an exceptional resource by which American students can experience direct involvement with foreign

students, literally from around the world. Before we can teach, we have much to learn. And our foreign students can be both students and teachers. And we can be, too.

(G) A banality of our time is that we live on a "shrinking globe." Yet, the gap between the haves the have nots widens; while multitudes prosper, starvation threatens entire peoples; and, as we probe the depths of space, unchecked population expansion endangers our planet. Nonetheless, jet travel and radio and television have linked the world. Educators must not ignore this, for education in its traditional form can achieve much, but only so much.

To touch the multitudes and to do so quickly, one means stands out: television. And how better could it be used than for global education? At the speed of light itself, TV can bond Berkeley with Bangkok, Chicago with Cairo. Modern technology can make them interactive: students and faculty can talk with one another, across a classroom, across a continent, across an ocean.

At present, the costs for this would be prohibitively high. But if consortia of U.S. universities worked together, the unit cost could be brought down. It can be done. In short, as we plan for global education in the 1980's and beyond, we must consider the emerging technology of the future.

But now I should like to attempt to view such matters in perspective. To do so, I turn to my professional field--astronomy. From it comes a story so vast and deep as almost to escape the boundaries of mind. And this cosmic epic has at core a concept seemingly common: time.

We make time, take time, spend time, waste time, lose time, kill time; yet, we virtually never think about time, much less understand it. Let us go back in time, even to its beginning.

For countless ages, there truly was darkness on the face of the deep. Then, some billions of years ago, a cataclysmic explosion brought forth the cosmos itself. And so the universe was born. Billions of years after that awesome fireball, large ensembles of material gravitated together. And so the galaxies were born.

In those early galaxies, some of the gas and dust congealed into large orbs, which slowly shrank and ultimately flickered into light. And so the stars were born. As the stars formed, debris was left behind, some of which locked to the stars. And so the planets were born.

Billions of years went by, with galaxies forming and stars burning, expanding, exploding, collapsing, dying. Then, some five billion years ago, on the periphery of an average galaxy in an unexceptional part of the universe, a particular star was born. On piece of debris number three circling that star, special events were to take place, for several billion years later a strange new apparition appeared--Homo sapiens. And so intelligent life was born.

More eons elapsed and that life evolved, creating civilizations and nations and war and peace and language and science and our modern world. And here we are in the year marked in time as 1980.

In such a cosmic sweep through space and time any rational person must feel an almost overpowering smallness. Our day-to-day concerns and trite prejudices shrink into infinitesimal nothingness.

Yet, there is another side, and it gives dignity and worth to life. For even though we are but specks in space with lifespans that are but ticks in time, we nonetheless can comprehend a system far vaster than ourselves. This ability, together with our ethical concerns, constitute some of humankind's most ennobling characteristics.

We are able to understand because each of us possesses one of nature's greatest gifts--a few hundred grams of human brain. Being all that separates absolute ignorance from perception of truth, that irreplaceable brain can reach its full potential only one way--through education.

And now the mosaic takes form. Perhaps more than ever, the dignity, the worth of education becomes clear.

From the astronomer's perspective, there are no geopolitical borders, only the shared globe, the blue marble in the black eternal night, the piece of debris number three. Quite literally, we shall learn to live together or we shall perish together.

Global education alone will not ensure our survival. But at least it is a step in the right direction. It is not merely desirable; it is imperative.

Developments and Prospects Following the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies

Sven Groennings
Professional Staff Member
Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities
U.S. Senate

The President's Commission's Report has contributed enormously to a reinvigoration of interest in international education across the nation and across all levels of education. It was timely, coming just before the creation of the new Department of Education, and in good time to be useful conceptually as the Congress prepared to reauthorize the international education programs which the new Department would be administering.

The follow-up has taken several directions: the new Title VI of the Higher Education Act, replacing NDEA-VI; the formation of a National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, incorporated in New York in May, 1980, which is now developing an agenda which will include several studies; and fresh attention to the curriculum and institutional structure for the international dimension within colleges and universities.

The new Title VI will be helpful to colleges and universities, enabling some to maintain established national foreign language and area study centers and others to develop regional centers. Four-year institutions will be favored especially by Section 604, providing grants to strengthen undergraduate programs of instruction. This Section lists several kinds of possible projects and activities which may win support on a two-year basis or, for consortia, up to three years. Hopefully, these provisions of Title VI will have strong catalytic effect.

Four-year institutions also will be eligible for assistance under Title VI's new Part B, which links business and international education, offering a bright prospect for creativity and reinvigoration of programs traditionally separate on most campuses. This is a dollar-for-dollar matching grant program, an incentive to seeking business support.

The initiative must come from the colleges and universities, and their interest must be manifest if appropriations are to follow. The new Higher Education Act is in place for five years. Political action on international education moves now to the budgetary process in the Executive branch and to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. Additionally, it will move early next year to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which will hold hearings on the activities of the International Communication Agency, which among other things administers the Fulbright Programs.

Foundations are providing most of the sustenance for the new National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies. For many years the foundations had contributed as much as NDEA to international education, but it is in the nature of foundations to move their seed-money efforts to new fields, and the appropriate time seemed to coincide with the reduced appeal of international orientations which accompanied the Vietnam War and various demands to align their efforts with the domestic concerns highlighted by President Johnson's Great Society and War on

Poverty. As the new National Council defines needs and priorities for future effort, perhaps the foundations will increase their attention to international education.

Members of our corporate community, which now earns a third of its income from export and foreign investment, have shown considerable interest in the new Part B, and some of them will become contributing members of an expanded international education constituency. Given strong college and university initiative, this can be a very positive development.

The long-term prospects for Title VI funding are not predictable, but are at the moment the brightest they have been for many years. One cannot reasonably expect enormous change, yet there is encouraging new commitment both in the Congress and in the new Department of Education, and the opportunities within the new legislative framework are broader than ever before. The Federal funding outlook merits closer analysis.

The FY-1981 Budget

The greatest increase in many years seems assured. It may be helpful to review the progress and indicate just where we are, especially as the budgetary development has received much less attention than the new authorizing legislation.

A year ago members of Congress wrote to President Carter recommending that the FY-1981 budget request for NDEA-VI, which has been funded at less than $20 million annually, be increased to $30 million. The House letter, dated October 8, 1979, was signed by William Ford, John Brademas, Paul Simon, Timothy Wirth, Carl Pursell, Millicent Fenwick, Clement Zablocki and Speaker Thomas O'Neill. There was a parallel November 5 letter by Senators Claiborne Pell, Robert Stafford, Jacob Javits, Jennings Randolph and Harrison Williams.

Secretary Hufstedler, approaching the President personally, achieved a $30 million FY-1981 budget request for international education programs, of which $23 million would be for Title VI (up from $17 million) and $7 million would be for the Department's portion of the Fulbright Program (Sec. 102B6) (up from $3 million).

Naturally, increments lead to questions about allocation, and some of you who were seeking ways to overcome weaknesses in undergraduate programs will recall that OMB proposed concentrating Title VI money upon area study dissertations and cutting back undergraduate programs as well as programs focusing upon topics or issues.

These emphases conflicted with the emerging constituency and legislative consensus, as reflected in the proposed new Title VI and the Report of the President's Commission. Here the assumptions were that a broadly balanced approach is needed in the long-term, involving all levels of education and undergraduate programs, to assure improved citizenship education as well as a continuing flow of talent into the graduate schools (a 1978 GAO study had evaluated undergraduate and graduate programs positively). Other assumptions were that functional concerns would be of increasing importance and that the future would require linkages between functional and area expertise.

As we now have a new legislative framework, of course the Congress' allocations will follow the philosophy of the new Title VI. The FY-1981 appropriations process has not been completed. A continuing resolution holds until December 15. The House-passed appropriations bill provides $28 million for international education programs. The Senate Committee on Appropriations, which will resume its consideration in November, seems likely to accept the $28 million figure.

The greatest increase in many years thus seems likely. In terms of percentage jumps, future increments are not likely to be so dramatic, yet some real advances seem possible despite adverse circumstances in the general funding environment.

Future Funding: The Barriers

The most dynamic areas of Federal policy formulation in the next few years are likely to be in the foreign and defense fields and in economic policy, particularly energy and reindustrialization. There are portents of a new era of international confrontation which would put upward pressure on the defense budget.

Federal budget deficits will continue to be a pressing concern. There are not likely to be major new Federal programs in the human resources field. Budget expansion in this general area will be driven mainly by entitlements, while expenditures for entitlement programs are likely to contribute to constraint in appropriating for other programs. Thus, there probably will not be much real growth in most Federal education programs.

During the last year liberals have joined conservatives in seeking budgetary constraint and a balanced budget, yet this year will end with a whopping Federal deficit of $40-50 billion even after a Presidential "born again" budget. A change of Administration is more likely to result in critical re-examination of Federal education programs than in a new bonanza.

There are powerful new institutional forces within the Congress working toward spending control. In the current Congress, for the first time, Congress has made its budget resolution (May 15 deadline for passage in each body, which deadline was missed) binding upon committees, and the Budget Committees have been given broad authority to direct cuts in particular programs. The consequences are several: budgets are kept within tighter bounds than before; the philosophy of appropriations authorizations is away from ideals and toward existing appropriations levels, adjusted for inflation, as in the new Higher Education Act; the work of authorizing committees is delayed pending the clearances of the Budget Committee--witness this year's struggle over the Higher Education Act; appropriations are delayed--only three of 13 appropriations bills for FY-1981 have cleared both Houses, so that the Department of Education and others are operating on a continuing resolution until December 15; and conflicts over the budget reconciliation between the Houses (September 15 deadline for passage) have left us without such a reconciliation until after the November elections.

This summer the House and Senate agreed to approximately $350 million in rescissions in education funding for FY-1980, cutting back what already had been appropriated. Procedurally, rescissions are initiated by Presidential message to the Congress. There were cuts in BEOG awards, energy research, health professions grants, money to eliminate architectural barriers to the handicapped, ESEA Title I

concentration grants, funds for guidance, counseling and testing, and money for the NIE.

It is an old maxim of appropriations politics that those programs that are weakest in political support are most likely to be targeted for cuts and those that are least effective politically are least likely to win increases.

Future Funding: A Brighter View

While we face a time of constraint, the prospects for the Department of Education's international education programs are relatively good. Their time has come.

A new Department acquires international representational responsibilities and must add some weight to its international dimension, as has been done by creating a Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Education. The Department representing education should not be seen as relatively parochial.

The nation's international interests have grown enormously, so that the rationale for citizenship education has joined the established need for expertise, and circumstances have added the economic rationale to that of national security.

After no major reform in the legislative framework since the passage of NDEA in 1958, there is the fresh re-focusing and encouragement of a new-in-1980 Title VI, expanded in concept and strong in its political sponsorship.

The funding base is small, so significant gains could be achieved by relatively small increments. There are new needs, as indicated in the new law. More catching up is in order, as the real value of the old NDEA sums was in decline for a decade or longer. The steady reduction of international education's share of the OE-ED budget, down to about two hundredths of one percent of that budget, is out-of-phase with the country's direction more generally.

The constitutency, while small, is buttressed by the force of events and an upbeat sense of progress, and it is growing and winning attention within broader educational associations. There are signs of improved communications across sub-groups and levels of education. The diverse interests within this field are doing a better job of pulling together than in the past.

Moving NDEA Section 603 into ESEA should have the effect of eliminating any sense of competition across levels of education and could lead to some positive reinforcement. There are three line items rather than one. The authorization levels for FY-1981 through FY-1985 are:

(1) for international and foreign language study: $45,000,000; $50,000,000; $60,000,000; $70,000,000; $80,000,000;

(2) for Part B, business and international education: $7,500,000 each year;

(3) for ESEA III-N grants to promote international understanding: $5,250,000; $6,750,000; $8,250,000; $9,000,000; $9,000,000.

There is provision in Title VI for ar Advisory Board with public and inter-agency representation. The Congress intends that the Board strengthen various relationships and attract attention to needs in international education.

There are numerous indications that the most significant educational issue during the 1980's will be educational quality, which may join "access" and "equity" as one of the dominant justifications for Federal educational policies. In the 1950's the shock of Sputnik led to concerns about excellence and our adequacy in the face of world competition--and led to NDEA. It would be natural, in parallel, given the strongly national justification for encouraging international education, for the Department to make international education one of its major contributions to the enhancement of educational quality.

Finally, while most of the Department's programs are justified in terms of promoting access and equity in American society, the distinctive national security/economic rationales for the international education programs can give the Department an obvious relevance and positive role in any era in which foreign policy, defense and international economic issues are ascendant.

Part B of Title VI as the Best Opportunity

Part B, which is linked to the national need to improve export performance, is the boldest initiative and challenge in the new law. It has strong support in the Senate, especially within the Senate Export Caucus, and interest is growing in state governments, various Federal agencies--especially the Departments of State and Commerce, corporations, and universities and their business schools. It can bring a strong new constituency to international education and lead to significant changes in campus programs.

As a dollar-for-dollar matching grant program, it is potentially the most catalytic initiative to date in the field of international education. From the Federal budgetary viewpoint, it is a chance to double the impact of each Federal dollar, yet not one Federal dollar will be spent unless a private match is achieved in the context of a proposal acceptable to the Department. From the perspective of growth in the field of international education, Part B offers more change than anything else in the legislation, to a maximum of $15 million in combined Federal and non-Federal funding. It wasn't long ago that the entire NDEA-VI budget was $15 million.

For the Department, Part B provides a unique opportunity to align itself and education with the "mission agencies" in meeting national economic needs as well as a chance to improve upon the low level of corporate support for educational programs. Part B would also be the Department's most cost-effective program.

The Advisory Board, which will include business community representatives, will expect a good launch for Part B. Failure to get off to a good start would give the business community the impression that the Department lacks serious commitment.

Delays in implementation can dampen interest and response from the field, yet it is characteristic of Departments that they are inclined to proceed cautiously, take time to assess carefully any constituencies which are new to them, and consume time establishing and testing their own procedures, and thus quite possibly provide an anemic response to their opportunity, for example by presenting

too low a budget request.

There still is time to begin in FY-1981, even with only $1 or $1.5 million, which would at least be a launch even if Part B were to start out as the smallest program in the Department. The Administration had requested $30 million for FY-1981, and the House approved $28 million. There is room for the Senate, which proposed Part B, to accept the House's $28 million and fulfill the Administration's request by adding $2 million for Part B. If the Department is serious about its opportunity, it should request $4 million in the second year and intend to move toward full funding thereafter.

From the standpoint of the colleges, Part B merits strong and timely interest.

Success Requisites

The prospects for international education depend mainly upon creative leadership on the campuses and in the schools, upon the support of business, and upon the constituency's relationship with the Federal Government. The Congress tends to respond to its constituencies. In this regard, progress will require focusing:

-- upon the annual budget/appropriations process, with timely attention to all stages and early attention to the potential of Part B.

-- upon expressing interest to members of Congress and informing them about international education needs. As a result of rapid turnover on Capitol Hill, there are many new members who are not familiar with international education concerns or the constituency interest. Especially following the departure of Senator Fulbright, future Congressional leadership in this field needs to be developed and broadened in numbers.

-- upon constituency coordination, unity and outreach. International education has many components and sub-groups representing different disciplines, levels of education and kinds of institutions. These elements face, in each House of Congress, a division of international education jurisdiction between subcommittees on education and on foreign relations and the corresponding subcommittees of the Committees on Appropriations. International education is not the primary concern of any subcommittee. The constituency will be strongest when it pulls together.

-- upon a long-term mechanism for assuring that the constituency maintains and develops a vision for the future. Five years will pass before the legislation will need to be reauthorized, but the vision will need constructive development well in advance.

Foreign Language Teaching

Dr. Richard Brod
Director, Foreign Language Programs,
Modern Language Association of America and

Dr. Peter Eddy
Director, ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics
Center for Applied Linguistics

This paper treats four separate but related topics: the foreign language requirement in American higher education; the coordination (or lack of it) between language teaching in secondary and higher education; linguistics and language teaching; cooperation between bilingual education and foreign language education. In addition, six recommendations for action are offered for the consideration of the AAC National Assembly on Foreign Language and International Studies.

Requirements

In calling for the restoration of college language requirements, the Perkins Commission undoubtedly recognized that such requirements will not automatically produce the cadre of fluent language and area specialists that, in their words, "our nation's security" requires. By implication, at least, the Commission was able to distinguish the general educational value of language study from its specialized uses. To the extent that requirements reflect the goals of general education, they are the province of each faculty, acting autonomously to implement its collective choices of educational objectives for its students. This conference, the AAC, and its cooperating associations should, we believe, urge colleges and universities to adopt a general education requirement in foreign language study. Properly planned and taught, a required language program can lead students to a minimal level of functional proficiency in speaking and reading the chosen language, and can, moreover, lead them to understand (1) the nature of language and human communication; (2) the concept of parity of human cultures, and some sense of their complexity and diversity; and (3) the interrelationship of language and culture in human society.

These latter objectives have always been treated as accidental byproducts of language study, and little systematic attention has been paid to their attainment. We believe, however, that these objectives constitute the primary justification for the retention (or restoration) of language requirements; we believe they should be central, not peripheral, to the language curriculum. To make such instruction possible, however, considerable retraining of teachers at all levels will be needed. We share the Perkins Commission's strong support for the creation of teacher-training institutes and would insist that the curriculum of such institutes include instruction in theory of language and culture, applied linguistics and sociolinguistics, in addition to advanced-level training in language skills.

The development of language study in general education is, we repeat, the heart of the problem. It is one way, perhaps the best way, to foster the changes in attitude and awareness that everyone agrees our society needs. At the same time, an effort must be made to increase the number of persons trained in business, industry, the sciences, professions, and the arts who combine with their specialties an intimate knowledge of a world area or region and working fluency in one or more of its languages. Growth in the number of such specialists was, in fact,

one of the objectives of the Perkins Commission's recommendations and it is clearly associated in their minds with national security needs in the broadest sense.

Articulation

The question of coordination between secondary and higher education foreign language programs is a complex one, since the institutions involved are so diverse that true curricular articulation is virtually impossible. Standardized definitions and tests of proficiency would do much to facilitate the transition from one educational level to the next. The key to this transition, however, is the fostering of a cooperative attitude among the faculty members at the various levels involved. Rather than accusing one another of being incompetent in the subject matter and demanding too little of students, or of being so interested in academic specialty and research that elementary and intermediate language instruction fall by the wayside, faculty at all levels should attempt to understand one another's problems and to exchange views at professional meetings and elsewhere.

College and university departments of foreign languages can take steps to make the transition from secondary school less traumatizing to language students. For example, they can (1) emphasize to instructors the importance of early estimation of the strengths and weaknesses of their students so as to avoid their being placed at an unsuitable level; (2) test incoming students with appropriate placement instruments; (3) publish entrance criteria for various language courses in more precise terms than is usually now the case; and (4) publish a more accurate overview of the activities in each course, so that students will have a better idea of what to expect from them.

Linguistics

During the 1950s and early 1960s, language pedagogy and linguistic inquiry were much more closely linked than they are today. Twenty years ago, linguists were convinced that they knew everything worth knowing about the process by which languages are learned, and that their findings had important implications for the teaching of foreign languages. Some individuals even referred to the audiolingual approach to language teaching as the "linguistic method."

Today, the application of linguistic research to language-teaching pedagogy is less clearly defined, and sweeping claims for the role of linguistics in the training of teachers are much less frequently heard. A relatively small number of linguists are working in the area of second language acquisition, which includes such sub-areas as the study of "interlanguage" and error analysis. While their research has clear relevance to the language-learning situation, the bulk of this research is being done by individuals who do their teaching in and draw their data from the field of English as a second language; unfortunately, only a small proportion of this process is taking place in departments of foreign languages. Yet the individuals who are trained and motivated to do this kind of research are precisely those who could form the nucleus of a revitalized foreign language-teaching profession, influencing practice not only in higher education but in elementary and secondary schools as well. The revitalization of foreign language teaching in this country will require the effort of a cadre of individuals who are not only conscientious about their own teaching but who have research interests that relate to their teaching and draw sustenance from it. Steps should be taken to encourage this kind of research activity, both through the re-training of currently employed

faculty and the inclusion of appropriate curricula in the doctoral and masters level degree programs supplying foreign language faculty to higher education.

Bilingual Education

On most campuses where there is activity in bilingual education, departments of foreign languages are not involved. While there are varied reasons for this fact, language department faculty would probably cite the following as the most common: (1) bilingual education is a social equity issue and is only of secondary concern as an educational issue; (2) bilingual education affects elementary (and perhaps secondary) schools, and is therefore to be dealt with by schools of education, not language departments; and (3) the languages spoken by the groups concerned with bilingual education are frequently not the standard variety, and should therefore not be taught and learned in an academic environment.

In a number of institutions, however, language departments have been able to work cooperatively with schools of education and with public and private schools. Although their success frequently depends upon local circumstances and the personalities and interests of the individuals concerned, it is likely that some aspects of these examples of bilingual/foreign language collaboration could be adapted to other situations. A study of several such collaborative efforts which described the successful elements involved and which was disseminated among both the bilingual community and institutions of higher education could do much to bring together these two potential allies.

Recommendations

1. Colleges and universities should require as part of their general education program instruction in a foreign language leading to: (a) an intermediate level of proficiency in speaking and reading; (b) awareness of basic concepts concerning the nature of language; (c) a knowledge of the culture of the language studied. Ideally, language study requirements should be stated in terms of proficiency levels. Until nationally accepted norms can be defined, institutions should require two years of language study with a minimum of four contact hours per week.

2. Colleges and universities should find ways to encourage students to achieve advanced levels of language proficiency appropriate to their fields of concentration, whether in liberal arts or in pre-professional programs. For example, institutions should develop intensive language programs, cooperative study abroad programs, interdisciplinary programs combining language study with an academic speciality, or internship abroad.

3. Colleges and universities should modify their criteria for promotion and tenure to reward faculty who work to strengthen linkages between secondary and higher education.

4. To assure continuity between high school and college level language instruction, colleges and universities should make available accurate descriptions of curricular prerequisites and objectives, and place greater priority on the placement of students through better use of appropriate tests and counseling by faculty.

5. The foreign language-teaching profession needs to expand its cadre of researchers in language acquisition. To this end, members of the profession should be encouraged to pursue such research, and institutions should be encouraged to reward them for it and to seek funds for faculty development in this area.

6. A study should be undertaken to locate, analyze, and describe to a broad audience programs where bilingual education and foreign language education have worked together for the mutual benefit of both language minority and majority students. This study should focus on the implications of such programs for elementary and secondary education as well as for higher education, with a special emphasis on college and university departments of foreign languages.

Curriculum Development in International Studies

Dr. James E. Harf
Professor of Political Science
Executive Director
Consortium for International Studies Education
The Ohio State University

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the recommendations of the President's Commission with respect to international studies curriculum development. Emphasis is to be placed on (1) the implications of its recommendations for colleges and universities, (2) the feasibility of these recommendations, and (3) priorities among them. Three areas of concern have been suggested by the organizers of this conference: study abroad/overseas study; international/area studies/intercultural; and global education.

First, let us isolate those specific recommendations of the President's Commission which relate to the pedagogical (particularly undergraduate) aspects of these three areas. Ten such recommendations focus on undergraduate students.

(1) Within the limits of funding, and initially on an experimental scale only, eligibility under the Fulbright programs should be extended to include exceptional junior- and senior-year undergraduates on a nationally competitive basis.

(2) Within the limits of funding, ECA should offer small grants to assist in the development of reciprocal institution-to-institution undergraduate exchanges, with emphasis on regions of the world now less involved in such exchanges.

(3) Colleges and universities in general should strengthen and improve the structure, quality, coverage and utility of their undergraduate offerings in the field of international studies, and should relate these offerings more directly to vocational as well as cultural and intellectual goals.

(4) Colleges should require at least two or three courses in international studies of all bachelor's degree candidates.

(5) A 'domestic' junior year program should be established for students wishing to concentrate in international studies but enrolled in institutions with limited resources in this field.

(6) With the possible exception of some so-called pure sciences, international or comparative perspectives should be part of the teaching of most subjects.

(7) Colleges and universities should offer both area studies (the study of foreign societies and cultures) and issues studies (the study of international relations) and the principal issues and problems in U.S. relations with other countries, and should better integrate the two categories.

(8) In general, colleges and universities should help and encourage their faculties to acquire, improve, and maintain international knowledge, skills and experiences that will enable them to teach more effectively in the international field.

(9) A program of approximately 200 federal institutional grants per year should be established for the development or improvement of undergraduate International Studies Programs (ISP's), including the training or retraining of faculty. Grants should range from $20,000 to $80,000 a year (with an average of $40,000) for a total of $8 million.

(10) The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education and the National Institute of Education should give higher priority to international studies.

Before addressing the specific task of this paper, an observation is in order. Undergraduate education in the three areas of concern was not a major emphasis of the Commission. Despite the fact that most (97% in one study) undergraduates are not enrolled in any course whose content falls within the domain of our interest, most of the efforts of the Commission were directed to language training, advanced training (particularly at the traditional and "more prestigious" area centers), and exchange of scholars. Any observer of the Commission's private and public deliberations will recall that the training of undergraduates in international or global studies--particularly those students at institutions other than the very prestigious research-oriented institutions of New England, Chicago, and California with thriving federally-funded centers and programs or at the very best of the prestigious liberal arts colleges--was largely ignored. Despite the efforts of a few Commission members, many professional associations, speakers at the various Commission hearings, and the consultant hired by the Commission to survey undergraduate needs at institutions nationwide and to present their recommendations, the Commission hierarchy chose, instead, virtually to ignore the pleas of these individuals to address the current inadequate situation in undergraduate education at the vast majority of institutions with far-ranging and actionable recommendations.

Let us now examine the list more closely. An initial reading reveals that, in fact, many of the recommendations are characterized by qualities of generality and non-actionability. For example, #3 advises institutions "to strengthen and improve" offerings as well as "to relate (them) to vocational as well as cultural and intellectual goals." Would we have expected the Commission to recommend that we weaken our courses and offer them in a vacuum? Or examine #8 which suggests faculties ought to improve themselves. Again, consider how the alternative recommendation would read. Third, #10 asks FIPSE to give higher priority to international studies. Would not a recommendation which suggested that FIPSE be required to allocate "X" percentage of funds to proposals with an international thrust be far better? And finally, #7 suggests that both area and issues studies be offered and that they be better integrated. Again, although the advice is sound, the suggestion that courses must be offered hardly begins to address the fact that all students in some fashion must be exposed to such courses. And how are the area and issues courses to be integrated?

Another characteristic of the list of recommendations is that when actionability exists, far-reaching scope does not. Consider #1, which specifically calls for undergraduates to be included in Fulbright study abroad programs. The

Commission suggested that some exceptional students be included "within the limits of funding, and initially on an experimental scale only." Recommendation #2 also suggests that some "small grants" be used to develop institution-to-institution undergraduate exchanges but, again, only "within the limits of funding." These two recommendations, particularly when read in the context of the major emphasis placed on the movement of scholars back and forth between the United States and other parts of the world, suggest that few undergraduates will be the beneficiaries of such programs.

Four recommendations remain, three actionable suggestions and one of a general nature but within which is found the philosophy which ought to guide institutional administrators as they map out a campus strategy. Let us consider the former group. Recommendation #4 advises colleges to require two or three international studies courses of all degree candidates. This would insure that all students were exposed to either some society or culture other than their own or to an analysis of an issue which extended beyond American borders. The recommendation might have gone further to suggest that a basic course in global perspectives or some other such course be mandatory in today's ever increasingly interdependent world. Nonetheless, the recommendation, although certainly representing a minimum approach to the total program, is a sound one and certainly "doable" within the context of current institutional budgetary constraints.

Recommendation #5 focuses on a "domestic" junior year program whereby students at the typical undergraduate institution with limited international resources can matriculate to an institution with a major international center. This recommendation also represents a laudable approach to our problem and the administrative logistics ought to be easily overcome (with the problem of FTE's and state subsidies probably being the most difficult one).

The final concrete recommendation with the most far-reaching implications is #9, which would allocate $8 million to create 200 federal institutional grants per year for undergraduate international studies programs (average grant is $40,000). Here the Commission finally addressed its mandate squarely, for the evidence is overwhelming that current undergraduate curriculum development grants administered by the Office of Education (average of about $30,000) have had far-reaching positive effects. Should the Congress agree to fund the new program at the recommended amount, substantial improvement in undergraduate international education is likely.

The final recommendation, #6, suggests that an international or comparative perspective be part of most courses. This general but far-reaching recommendation is at the heart of any meaningful attempt to carry out both the mandate of the Helsinki Accords and President Carter's directive creating the Commission. There are philosophical, practical, and administrative reasons for both this suggestion of an infusion strategy and its endorsement by most of the institutional respondents to the Commission's questionnaire. For our purposes, the set of administrative reasons is most relevant. Budgets are typically allocated (in a zero-sum fashion) through the department. Any suggestion of a new department or, even more threatening, a new kind of program which moves beyond the traditional department model immediately generates advanced levels of proprietary attitudes. In a steady state or declining academic economy, the necessary impact will never be made by advocating, particularly as the single strategy, new curricula, new programs, new departments, and new administrative infrastructures to handle this new set of activities.

In sum, although the Commission chose not to focus on the normal undergraduate in a typical institution, some positive features emerge that can guide college administrators. First, the report creates a legitimate rationale and provides ammunition for a greatly increased emphasis on an international or global dimension throughout an institution's set of programs. Second, imaginative campus leaders can provide the substance to the general recommendations of the Commission. And finally, the actionable recommendations are on target and are feasible for most institutions.

ADDENDUM

The following list represents a summary of the recommendations made by this author in his formal report to the Commission in June, 1979.

RECOMMENDATION No. 1 - The international component of the undergraduate experience must not take place in a vacuum as an isolated set of activities. Rather, it must be integrated completely into every aspect of the undergraduate curriculum.

RECOMMENDATION No. 2 - Funds should be allocated by the federal government for the development and dissemination of a model(s) for the infusion of the undergraduate curriculum with an international dimension (cost: $100,000).

RECOMMENDATION No. 3 - Funding should be made available in small sums (under $40,000) for institutions to begin the process of introducing the internationalization of the curriculum.

RECOMMENDATION No. 4 - Funds should be allocated by the federal government for the design and dissemination of a basic course in global perspectives (cost: $100,000).

RECOMMENDATION No. 5 - A monograph should be commissioned which demonstrates the vocational opportunities available to students with a major international component to their program. This should receive the widest circulation. Popular media should be provided with commercial messages for transmission (cost: $200,000).

RECOMMENDATION No. 6 - In addition to the traditional area centers, a number of centers of comparable magnitude for transnational studies, global studies, and specific transnational problems should be created. These should have an extensive outreach function (cost: $100,000 per center).

RECOMMENDATION No. 7 - Major knowledge-producing centers must be given a mandate as part of the requirements for funding and incentives to engage in extensive outreach programs with both the undergraduate clientele at their own institution and all undergraduate institutions within a specified geographic radius (cost: 15% outreach should be maintained).

RECOMMENDATION No. 8 - Local consortia arrangements should be encouraged and seed funds provided (cost: $8,000 per)

RECOMMENDATION No. 9 - Funding must be provided by the federal government for campus inventories of human resources (cost: $10,000 per institution).

RECOMMENDATION No.10 - Funding must be provided for both international and non-international faculty educational travel abroad (cost: $3,000 per person).

RECOMMENDATION No.11 - Funding must be made available for financially disadvantaged students to study abroad (cost: $3,000 per person).

RECOMMENDATION No.12 - The undergraduate international studies program in the Office of Education should continue to be funded at the same level per grant but with the number of grants substantially increased (cost: $40,000 per increase in number of grants).

RECOMMENDATION No.13 - A national center for the dissemination of information on undergraduate programs, materials, human resources, and smiliar topics should be put into operation (cost: $100,000 per year).

RECOMMENDATION No.14 - Funding should be provided for national and regional faculty in-service training workshops (cost: $15,000 per national and $5,000 per regional workshop).

RECOMMENDATION No.15 - Particular emphasis should be placed on the encouragement and funding of programs which show the cooperation of liberal arts and the professional schools.

RECOMMENDATION No.16 - A study should be commissioned and the findings published of the proper use of foreign students as a resource (cost: $50,000).

RECOMMENDATION No.17 - Funding must be made available to materials developers for the creation of materials of an international nature for inclusion in general courses (cost: $150,000 per year).

Interinstitutional Cooperation: An Avenue to the World

Dr. W. Werner Prange
Professor and Director
University of Wisconsin
Urban Corridor Consortium

Boldly acknowledging America's "scandalous incompetence in foreign languages" and "our dangerously inadequate understanding of world affairs," the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies launched its stark documentation of decline in the international dimension of American education. That our nation's intellectual isolationism delineated in the Commission's 1979 Report should exist at all is deeply disturbing; that it should continue is unthinkable.

Institutions of higher education, though, do have intelligent alternatives in this crisis, an important one of which is to develop their international education potential through the appealingly pragmatic mechanism of interinstitutional cooperation. Wisely designed cooperative programs, especially in such potentially high-cost arenas as international education, enable even small institutions to pursue their individual academic missions more effectively while they also contribute immediately and realistically to the reversal of the disturbingly insular trend identified by the President's Commission.

Consortial relationships in American higher education are not new. For over forty years educators have experienced, as both participants and observers, the benefits and failures of interinstitutional cooperation, and the advantages of intelligently designed and administered consortia are well-known. In 1979 the Council for Interinstitutional Leadership (CIL), a progressive "consortium of consortia" established to promote voluntary cooperation among academic institutions, completed and published the results of its two-year cost-benefit study of such cooperative programs. The overall validity, fiscal savings, and academic benefits of the programs assessed in the CIL report are impressively convincing. More specifically, certain inherent multi-institutional advantages of interinstitutional cooperation attest to the value of this approach as an immediately available means to advance the cause of international education, in particular.

Where strong and successful international programs exist, interinstitutional cooperative agreements tend to define their structure to a far greater extent than chance alone would account for. The reasons for this phenomenon and a few urgent recommendations rooted in those reasons comprise this brief overview of interinstitutional cooperation as a potentially vital force for positively redirecting American attitudes and actions through improved international education.

Authority, availability, and control are the fundamental features of cooperative programming that initially suggest its usefulness in the challenge to improve foreign language and international studies programs in the United States. First, the cooperative programming approach requires no new legislative or regulatory authority. The power to act is here....now! Second, the cooperative approach is not exclusionary. It is universally available to small institutions and large, regardless of grade level, public or private status, profit or nonprofit motive. Finally, the scope and cost of cooperative programs are determined and controlled by the cooperating affiliates. Programs can be as broad or as narrow as institutional priorities dictate or allow. Beyond these basic advantages of interinsti-

tutional cooperation, however, are several benefits holding even more dramatic promise for the future of international education.

The first category of these benefits involves program cost and availability of funding. It is obvious to anyone who has recently traveled abroad that the value of the U.S. dollar is no longer what it was in "the good old days." How foolish, then, for colleges and universities to ignore the obvious financial advantages of sharing program costs, both abroad and here at home. Salary for an overseas-based director and related support costs add up to substantial sums in these days of rampant inflation, and the early demise of many study-abroad programs is a direct reflection of this economic squeeze. Shared overhead, then, especially among smaller institutions,certainly cannot be ignored as an advantage of consortial international education programs.

Another related financial benefit of such interinstitutional cooperation is the opportunity to recruit that critical mass of program participants which makes the difference between a marginal, cash-starved program and a healthy, stable, continuous one. Economies of scale are simply not obtained by sending abroad fifteen students and an enthusiastic professor per semester. While those analysts so inclined may wish to calculate the exact enrollment required for optimum cost-effectiveness, common sense will readily confirm the financial logic of increasing the participant base through cooperative agreements.

A superbly successful example of this approach to expanding program volume is that of Iowa's Central College. In ten years of operation in six countries, Central College has involved over three thousand students in its study-abroad programming. Without cooperative agreements with hundreds of colleges and universities, though, this small midwestern private college with an enrollment only slightly beyond thirteen hundred could not have dreamed of providing these opportunities for its students.

A final comment on benefits related to cost and funding issues concerns the appeal that cooperative plans seem to generate in their pursuit of foundation and government support. Beyond cost-effectiveness, a certain aura radiates from joint programming, an aura of goodwill and credibility that often spells the difference between funding and rejection. When contrasted with the program idea of an individual faculty entrepreneur, for example, the well-developed cooperative program will carry home the dollars. This competitive edge, although subtly manifest, is another very real budgetary benefit of consortial planning for international programs.

A second major category of benefits resulting from interinstitutional cooperation in international education relates to program quality. Shared endeavors tend to broaden, to diversify, to enrich, and to stimulate intellectually those individuals and institutions involved. The Great Lakes Colleges Association (GLCA) is an outstanding instance of several small colleges cooperatively enjoying the benefits of such enhanced academic quality among their students and faculty. GLCA's study-abroad programs, several of which are sponsored jointly with the Associated Colleges of the Midwest, have earned a reputation for diversity, scope, and academic excellence that would have been beyond feasibility for any individual campus operating alone. Furthermore, GLCA is proud of the faculty development opportunities associated with its international programs which not only have heightened faculty morale and teaching effectiveness but have also helped revitalize careers and develop administrative expertise among participants.

Increasingly, too, foreign governments are attracted by this potential infusion of quality into their own educational systems and are consequently demanding reciprocity in international exchange programs. In short, these nations want equal opportunities for their own students and faculty to study "abroad." Along with this developing interest come their recognition and endorsement of the merits of consortia in providing optimum educational opportunities. In fact, a number of nations--most notably Japan--have expressed a strong preference for exchange agreements with groups of U.S. institutions, rather than with individual campuses, in order to provide their exchanges with the widest possible range of academic choices.

While the foregoing observations and examples are necessarily brief, more detailed documentation and case studies are available in such sources as the CIL's 1979 cost-effectiveness study and the recent, very readable Council on Learning anthology, Educating for the World View. What is important to note here is that interinstitutional cooperation offers significant, immediate means and incentives to develop our nation's international education programs. Of course, for institutions to align in a consortium merely to attract grant dollars or to recruit students will hardly comprise a successful program. A commitment to academic excellence and a genuine willingness to share resources and returns must be inherent in all consortial arrangements intent on both credibility and longevity. As Central College and GLCA so well illustrate, though, once that mutual commitment is established, the opportunities to improve foreign language and international studies programs become almost limitless.

Clearly, the interinstitutional approach to rapid expansion of foreign language and international studies is valid and is immediately available for implementation. From that fundamental premise, then, these concluding recommendations follow as rather simple, but nevertheless crucial, steps in American education's progress toward a more realistic, responsible world view:

1) The National Assembly should endorse interinstitutional cooperative approaches to expanding foreign language and international studies opportunities because of the inherent advantages and immediate availability of such approaches: interinstitutional cooperation exists now, it is cost-effective, and it succeeds.

2) Government and foundation funding programs for international education should formulate and implement regulations and guidelines requiring applicants to engage in and document exploration of interinstitutional arrangements as a condition of eligibility for funding.

3) Such funding programs should incorporate financial and other incentives for joint applicants, thereby endorsing and promoting the validity of interinstitutional cooperation for higher quality, cost-effective international education.

Faculty and Program Development in Foreign Languages

Dr. Guy Stern
Vice President and Provost
Wayne State University

For once we, in the field of foreign languages, are not alone. When we are told, as in the Report of the President's Commission, that many of us must "retool," we find also that new demands are imposed on virtually every academic discipline. Advances in basic research raise the expectations that practical applications of them must transform or improve the state of man and his environment. Thus, the unlocking of the secrets of the cell leads to the demand for the defeat of cancer; a greater understanding of motion and inertia calls for new experiments in auto safety; the exploration of laser beams unleashes a revolution in photography; and, as C. Day Lewis has suggested, new insights on the purpose of birdsongs might bring forth new poetry.

Each new demand, apparently coming at an ever faster rate, has posed new challenges to university faculties. In a recent address to the Council of Deans of my university I had occasion to pose one of these challenges:

> We must redirect, if need be, retrain our faculties. All around us we observe how professional obsolescence overtakes people while they are very much active on their jobs. Universities are no exception, hence there must be change--considered and enlightened--or, as has happened at times, unintelligent change will be imposed on us. We cannot stand still on programs. From the most prestigious colleges and universities to the most pedestrian there is the exploration of new educational needs, such as new interdisciplinary offerings, for example in political economy, or--this may surprise you--the establishment of a chair in university administration. We see the emergence of degrees in technology and of a greater variety of non-credit courses. I can think of nothing more urgent than a study concerning alignment of our current curricula with changing societal realities.

Such changes <u>are</u> taking place. In Wisconsin (as reported in an interview with an academic planner at that institution) some 275 faculty have participated in state-supported retraining and renewal projects. After a cautious start the program has enjoyed increasing faculty acceptance and now participation has become competitive. System-wide, it is supported by a budget of some $300,000. In our own academic discipline, a number of faculty have been given expanded capabilities and now teach in other language areas currently in high demand. Surely one of the reasons for the singular success of the Wisconsin program (and this is of paramount importance) is that a retraining project is never approved or undertaken unless there is a specific known need or slot for the participant's new skills.

In short, a considerable amount of work is already in progress. Let me illustrate before abstracting.

1) A professor of scientific German teams up with a chemist (who speaks some German) for a students' tour of a chemistry lab. He pretends that he is demonstrating his lab and its equipment to a group of visiting German nationals.

2) A similar arrangement, this time with Italian as the target language, leads to conducted tours through an art gallery.

3) At another university, a faculty member has instituted a program of exchanged lessons between students. A music student provides guitar lessons in exchange for instructions in the correct pronunciation of German songs.

4) Some years ago MIT provided basic science classes in three languages, i.e. designated sections of multi-sectional courses were held in German, French, and Russian. It may be timely to revive the custom; although, admittedly, changing old attitudes and finding qualified teachers will prove to be difficult. Plans are afoot by Professor Hartzler at the University of Massachusetts to institute such classes in his School of Business Administration.

5) To my mind one of the most promising efforts was the team-teaching of a business administration instructor and a language teacher. They gave annual orientation seminars off-campus, i.e. at large industrial firms, for young executives slated for overseas assignments.

6) Similar needs within government agencies led to team-teaching between a political scientist and a Russian language teacher.

7) Another language professor, this time of the Polish language, hit on a most ingenious scheme. She intensified her contacts with the Polish community and became, without any official title but for all practical purposes, the Director of a "Program-Abroad-While-at-Home." In short, she arranged for students to live with Polish families in her city, with the obligation to speak the target language and to engage in conversations concerned with the Polish cultural heritage and present-day developments. Payment for room and board was donated occasionally by the Polish-American family, or provided on a quid-pro-quo basis (through babysitting for example) or at cost to the student. Needless to add, the vision of the professor-director expanded together with that of the students.

8) Thirteen years ago Professor Helga Slessarev and I established in Hamburg, Germany, the first overseas Work-Study Program through the University of Cincinnati, helped with a grant from the Overseas Training and Assistance Branch of the Office of Education. Undergraduate students from across the nation's campuses and from nearly all disciplines were placed in career-related positions in Hamburg. Work was supplemented by field trips and study. Four years ago, "retooling" myself, I revived my friendship with the Cultural Senator of Berlin, Dr. Peter Glotz, and placed six students from the University of Maryland into government internship jobs in the city-state of Berlin.

9) A community college, Brevard College in Cocoa, Florida (as reported to me by its President, Dr. Maxwell King and its Provost, Dr. Robert Breuder) allocates 2% of its operating budget to faculty development and provides a generous share of this amount to its language instructors for exploring new teaching methods and for conducting workshops.

10) Professor Paula Gilbert Lewis introduced a variety of interdisciplinary courses at Howard University. She exemplifies her various efforts by a particularly telling case-in-point:

Existing courses in literature can be combined with course offerings in such departments as history, economics, and political science in order to establish programs, for example, in Latin American Studies, Afro-French Studies, Caribbean Studies, Multi-Ethnic Studies, Women's Studies, and French-Canadian Studies. In addition, a team-teaching approach can be utilized in courses oriented toward periods: Baroque, Romanticism, Surrealism, and the like. In these courses, specialists from related disciplines, such as literature, art, philosophy, and music can teach students in a course coordinated by one instructor. Whenever possible all participating teachers should be present at all class sessions. This newly acquired knowledge can also be incorporated into their own traditional courses to include an interdisciplinary tone.

11) Faculty and program development went forward in tandem at Broward Community College in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. President Alfred H. Adams and Director William Green involved faculty members from various disciplines in working out an international studies requirement for all certificate candidates at the college. Anticipating the Commission's request for a high-level administrative post for a coordinator of international programs, Dr. Green was placed in the Office of the Academic Vice-President to help each unit select pertinent required courses. As a salutary side effect of this requirement, both the faculty and the students became far more alert to languages and international studies.

At Wayne State University two Romance language professors, Sol Rossman and Louise Jefferson, are enlarging and enhancing secondary school education in French in Detroit's urban setting, thus creating new ties to both the Black urban community and to the Black francophone cultures of Africa and the Caribbean Black francophone literature and its cultural contexts. Professor Jefferson pursues a similar aim through an NEH-sponsored program for secondary school teachers of French. Professor Rossman provides contrastive knowledge of Black English and French as well as basic linguistic knowledge concerning dialects and of Black English as a dialect.

I should like to single out one emerging area for faculty re-deployment which deserves a lengthier treatment here. The tie between language skills and the world of business and commerce should be intensified, and become more varied. Approximately eight years ago I approached Dean Albert Simone, then newly appointed Dean of the College of Business Administration at Cincinnati, with the idea of creating a certificate program in International Business. Language majors, to qualify for such a certificate (together with their regular B.A. degree), were required to take basic courses in business administration. Students coming from the Business School, on the other hand, were required to take a special sequence in languages beyond their home college's offerings. Participants joined the program from both points of departure. Eventually the idea was replicated at other universities and, at Cincinnati, expanded to include a program at the MBA-level.

It occurs to me that this concept, given additional qualification on the part of language professors, holds promise for the future. It is becoming patently clear that American business and industry, in a continuously tightening competition, must send forth informed "ambassadors of good will" rather than conventional salesmen. Or, to cite another example, the American travel and leisure industry must cater in growing measure to an influx of foreign visitors. Language professors, willing to combine (in culture and/or conversation classes) traditional subject matter with a focus on business, industry, travel and leisure, will need an-

cillary skills. The acquisition of them is now possible through two approaches. Three universities, to my own knowledge, provide business training for faculty in the humanities during the summer. They are at New York University, the University of Chicago, and the University of Virginia. First reports attest to their excellence. Additional learning opportunities, if more modest, exist also on most campuses. In my experience business managers and financial administrators are sometimes willing to provide "hands-on" experience to volunteers. Dogging the steps of such administrators can be a valuable learning experience. The question arises: why should a language professor have this kind of knowledge at all, rather than leave the dispensing of specialized knowledge to a colleague from the associated non-language area? The answer suggests itself immediately from the converse analogy: just as a business administration professor profits from the broadening and changed perspective of language learning and, as the Commission indicates, from foreign study or exchanges, so does the language professor profit from the acquisition of new intellectual dimensions. As it stands now, neither the language professor nor the business professor nor the student see themselves involved with each other. That is both the point and the tragedy--both are reflecting a narrow view of themselves and their academic specialities. If the language professor could begin to feel a responsibility towards the business students, he would then be forced to consider what he has to offer as a language professor to the Business College student. If the student were given a truly broad view of future business opportunities, he too would wonder how a language could be of help to him in the future. The language professor might begin to see himself teaching a wider range of courses in addition to his specialty: perhaps even new courses in the Business College, or he can offer, as now happens at the University of Massachusetts under the leadership of Professor Albert M. Reh, a minor in Business German. The fact that publishers in German, French and Spanish have come out with appropriate textbooks and that an MS for Russian is in preparation appears to signify a trend towards broadening our field. Other examples, e.g. the teaching of translation skills (both written and oral) or in international hotel-and-restaurant management at community colleges, could be added.

As you see I have proceeded empirically. I have done so on purpose. What all the examples have in common is that, for one, they illustrate advocacies in the Commission's Report--team-teaching between language departments and other curricular areas, faculty self-renewal, overseas assignments for students and faculty in and beyond the languages, faculty links to ethnic communities, new links between students and faculty members of various departments, classes in a target language in the sciences and in professional schools, as well as changes in administrative structures for coordination of language and international studies programs. They have one other characteristic in common: they are all replicable. What I mean to suggest is that we not only try to implement the suggestions of the Commission, by attempting to evolve new blueprints but that we look for examples which the ingenuity of ourselves and others have already devised. For the ambitious program devised by the Commission we need not only funds, but also all the existent ideas--and their originators.

It is equally important to look at the postulate undergirding all such experiments: the good will of the faculty. How to mobilize it when it is not immediately present? What has not worked, to my mind, is an appeal to the survival instinct. Where an alertness to extinction does not exist, dramatizing that danger does not work. What does work is a reward system of departmental priorities in which redirection plays a key role. Deans and department heads must state clearly that new directions, at times, count for more than new publications. An appeal to idealism also may bear fruit. One institution, for example,

had an overwhelming response when the call went out that the campus was creating a language bank, that is, a list of professors capable of speaking various languages and willing to serve visitors from abroad. Motivation of faculty, in short, is crucial. Perhaps--and here is another abstraction to be extrapolated from the examples above--universities and scholars must seek a new self-perception.

The thought process leading to it might look as follows: many of the traditions with which we surround ourselves at universities have little to do with scholarship or academic disciplines. They are concerned with historical models of academic programs which some professors feel obliged to perpetuate. But such a pursuit distracts him or her from the one thing which is so important to any scholar--the need to constantly reevaluate and reexamine the materials of his or her academic discipline. Historical models of language programs at universities are a case in point. In the past--less so in the present--these have had a way of substituting form for meaning. The argument that a foreign language program cannot be changed is a statement concerning its form, not its meaning. Only when all language faculties are willing to reexamine the meaning of their academic programs in the light of how they are meeting the needs of their present student body, as well as their potential student body scattered throughout the university campus, can they further broaden their vision. As intellectuals we must see ourselves as evolving and becoming, not as being defined for all times. If indeed language faculties could continue to interpret themselves more broadly in terms of their university, or less narrowly in terms of their discipline, then language programs would develop along new and promising lines.

Can government be a helpmate in bringing about this strengthened motivation? A recent trip to China left me with the distinct impression that government can help. A few impressions from this trip will also illustrate that the Commission's recommendation to extend our exchange programs has not gone unheeded. I was part of a delegation from Wayne State University helping to establish an exchange relationship with the Peoples' Republic of China. Somewhat later a Wayne State expert on language teaching, Professor Daniel Behmer, was invited to be a Visiting Scholar in China. Both trips provided many valuable observations on foreign language instruction and international studies. The following observations and conclusions are his and mine.

The government of the People's Republic of China has determined that the first language priority for that country will be English, rather than the previous preference for Russian. In consequence, English teachers were recruited, by fiat, from all walks of life. It is rather awe-inspiring to witness how effective that directive has been. People everywhere--young and old--shopkeepers and students, all seem to be studying English.

The two main sources for instruction are daily English lessons on radio and television, and the popular Voice of America broadcasts. It is difficult for students to obtain English reading materials; current English newspapers and magazines produced in the West are only available at foreign bookstores, and are not available to the Chinese for purchase.

Our Chinese experience proved to us what can happen when people are truly motivated to study a foreign language. In both cities and villages people search for any and every opportunity to practice. My wife and I became private consultants to a postal clerk in Shanghai. Professor Behmer, during his teaching assignment in Shanghai and Hangchou, was frequently surrounded by twenty or more people wanting to practice their English. Their written and spoken English was excellent.

They even spoke with an American accent. "Are you studying at a language institute?" Behmer asked. "Oh, no," came the reply. "We are studying Chinese painting at a local factory. We are learning English by television." One immediate conclusion may be drawn: governments, whether autocratic or democratic, can be an effective motivating factor in foreign language study.

Also, the Chinese today see their study of English going decidedly beyond language and literature--and into international studies. For them, English is a tool which has important implications not only for their own development, but also for the development of Asia. They clearly see English as part of an outreach program which puts them into contact with the rest of the world.

The Chinese language scholars whom we met had an exceptional dedication that went beyond their love of their discipline or the individual interests of their students. They seem totally convinced that the future of their nation requires the study of English as the primary foreign language. Does not our own national welfare call for the same commitment to the learning of foreign languages? And cannot our language faculties, through additional skills, help to meet this national need?

The question remains: how can our language teachers acquire such added skills? Several existing models or proposed solutions come to mind.

1) Many universities already allow faculty members to register for courses and/or additional degrees at their own universities or to "audit" the classes of colleagues in other fields. Whatever strictures against such practices exist should be relaxed. (I recently broached our Graduate Council with a proposal aimed at relaxing our regulations and am hopeful of a positive response.)

2) I cited the example of intensive business administration summer school programs for colleagues in the humanities. In fact, these were overcrowded last summer; many qualified applicants were not admitted. We may need more of such intensive programs, especially given the national goal of reindustrialization and hence the need for multi-disciplinary skills, including languages. We also need to look for similarly intensive programs in journalism, the sciences, engineering, and other fields.

3) Last summer I visited Haus Wiesneck, near Freiburg, West Germany, a study center for in-service German instructors from the U.S. Financed, in part, by the German Federal Republic, the institute provides, during six weeks of intensive summer study, an up-to-date reintroduction to German cultural history. Guest speakers, from highly placed political figures to prominent artists, supplement a superb academic program. A center such as this could readily be replicated. I recommend that this meeting endorse the establishment of such centers in many other countries and encourage subsidies from their respective governments.

4) It has also been reported that not only students but also in-service professionals have been taking part in such traditional and secluded summer school programs as Middlebury and Wells Colleges.

5) As a participant of the first two Fulbright-Alumni Association Conventions, I can imagine another function for that body. Given the fact that a majority of its members have greatly advanced professionally, I would suggest a "homecoming" of that body--a one-week workshop abroad in which participants are brought up-to-date on their grantee country and reimmerse themselves in the language. Funding

might be shared by the U.S. and the target country.

6) Finally, we can begin faculty development with an institute right on our own campuses. I suggest that universities create a faculty forum to be called "Professional Institute for Faculty and Program Development." The institute would offer opportunities to faculty members to meet professors from other disciplines for the discussion of their disciplines and programs, for the exchange of professional information. Attendance at monthly seminars could be required for all non-tenured professors, and be voluntary for all others. Senior professors would be encouraged to provide leadership in the seminars. The philosophical basis for such a plan is a set of principles for language teachers--with (with minor changes) apply to the professional development of all professors:

(a) Every professor of language has an institutional commitment which is tied to the destiny of the total student body;

(b) Every professor of lanauge has an obligation to take the development of his academic speciality at least one step beyond what he envisaged at the time of his doctoral dissertation;

(c) Every university has the obligation to seek institutional ways which break down the divisions between academic specialities and encourage the integration of knowledge;

(d) Every university has the obligation to reward professors who are attempting to develop and implement programs which broaden the scope of the academic program.

The Professional Institute for Faculty and Program Development could be an opportunity for faculty members, young and old, to rediscover their personal interest and investment in a wide range of disciplines. Foreign language professors, working with colleagues from other areas, can gain from the encounter as much as they contribute.

(a) They can rediscover the art of learning about new fields, and find that by broadening the base of involvement in other university programs strengthen the base of their own programs. We, in the languages, have been criticized--and not only by the Commission's Report--for being outmoded in our methods and technology of teaching. Can we profit from the developments in, say, word processing in computer science, by computer-assisted individualized instruction, by the "delivery system" of educational television, by the multi-media approach of the art department, by the cluster-group concept in the classes of the social scientists? I think it is worth trying!

(b) They can experience that language study does not have to take place only within a language department, or within a narrow span of courses and that other colleges on the campus have need of their skills. The experiment at Brevard Community College points in this direction, with the above-listed beneficial results. A more extensive survey will undoubtedly locate other successful approaches to faculty development in the language areas.

Again, I have proceeded eclectically, if for another reason. I have some doubts whether the various state or federally supported centers, envisioned by the Commission, would be maximally effective. The plan of the Commission is in many respects a revival of the NDEA Institutes of some years back. To my mind the tie-in with universities, which is not without advantages, also has drawbacks. It precludes the total immersion possible at such sites as Middlebury in the U.S. or Haus Wiesneck abroad. Language and area-study learning proceeds best abroad or in a cloistered atmosphere. As a resource person at the Aspen Institute for the Humanities I found adults redirecting themselves to entirely new tasks under the stimulus of a sequestered and intellectually charged atmosphere. The model of Aspen, incidentally, might be invoked when we try to establish, as suggested by the Report, learning centers for men and women from business and industry, since the Aspen Institute, if for a different purpose, draws heavily from that sector for support and participation.

In conclusion, I would like to make a far more elusive suggestion. Let us simply call it style in the language departments. Our lanauge buildings, department offices and classrooms should reflect some of our new directions. There should be posters depicting foreign business firms and U.S. business firms abroad, as well as the usual scenic street scenes and portraits of luminaries of the past. The outside of buildings should reflect the national and ethnic ambiance of various cultures. Finally, there should be pictures of the rich and rejuvenated ethnic settings all around us, exemplifying the glory of American ethnic diversity.

Perhaps our current adversity in the languages will make us, through self-examination, better practitioners of our craft. As the medieval poet Notker put it:

Uva was ih
getrettot pin ih
vinum werdo ih

Grape I was;
was stepped upon;
wine I became.

Multicultural Education, Bilingual Education and Ethnic Studies: Implications for Foreign Language and International Studies

Dr. Carlos E. Cortés
Professor of History
University of California-Riverside

Educational reform movements abound throughout the United States. Most of these movements operate separately from one another; sometimes they even come into conflict over goals, strategies, and values, not to mention territory and resources. However, some movements share certain intrinsic interests and goals, which provide the basis for cooperative and mutually reinforcing action.

Nowhere within the arena of educational reform are the concerns more consonant and the opportunities more obvious than among the various components of intercultural education, such as foreign language studies, bilingual education, international studies, ethnic studies, and multicultural education. While each has its own history, rationale, individual identity, and special interests, they share even more--a concern for better intergroup and global communication, the quest for human understanding, the commitment to seeking such improved understanding and communication through education, and the dream of thereby contributing to a better world.

In its 1979 report, the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies vividly illustrated our nation's current crisis resulting from "Americans' scandalous incompetence in foreign languages" and our citizens' nearly pandemic ignorance of the various cultures of the world. It called for a full-scale educational assault on these sibling problems. But those incapacities--linguistic and intercultural--also exist in relation to our internal national diversity as well as to external global diversity.

As the federal government needs people with the language, area, and global competence to carry out our nation's international policy, government at all levels needs persons with language fluency, knowledge of ethnic groups, and intercultural abilities to address issues related to internal diversity. As private industry needs linguistically and culturally literate people to conduct international commerce, private industry also needs such people to work with an increasingly diverse national labor force and consumer population. As schools need teachers skilled in teaching foreign languages and about foreign areas to help prepare young people for a life of global diversity, schools also need teachers skilled in bilingual education and teaching about ethnic groups to help prepare young people for life of national internal diversity to go along with the national commonalities which bind us.

In short, for both internal and external reasons, the nation needs interculturally literate, multilinguistically competent people. Whatever their differing emphases and subject matter specializations, all those involved in aspects of intercultural education share the common quest of helping to develop such citizens. By pulling together, rather than apart, educators concerned with dealing constructively with diversity, whether external or internal, can contribute to their common and related goals.

The report recognizes these educational commonalities, although it does not explore in depth the mutually beneficial connections between foreign language and

international studies and other intercultural movements, such as multicultural education, bilingual education, and ethnic studies. While citing the nation's linguistic minorities as an "important national resource" and "a largely untapped resource of talent," the report makes only passing reference to bilingual education as a major avenue for maintaining and strengthening this national linguistic resource. While recommending "a greatly expanded role in intercultural teaching for ethnic and linguistic minorities," the report does not discuss their past and current contributions to intercultural teaching, particularly through K-12 multicultural education and college-level ethnic studies. While correctly lamenting the inadequacy of teaching about "other societies, especially the non-Western, which all too often are neglected in our schools," the report does not point out that this failure is exacerbated by a similar inadequacy in regard to America's ethnic cultures, or that K-12 multicultural education is attempting to reverse this process by addressing both the internal and external aspects of "cultural illiteracy."

The report has provided a valuable service by raising critical issues, expressing needs, and suggesting programs. It is now up to others to build from the report and explore the many possibilities for cooperation among the various components of intercultural education, the mutual gains that can result from such cooperation, and the mutual losses that will result if cooperation does not occur. The first step is to reconsider the report and expand its vistas in at least three natural directions:

(1) a reexamination of international education within the broader framework of intercultural education, which includes international, intranational, cross-national, and global dimensions;

(2) an elucidation of the significance of ethnic groups as a national resource; and

(3) a greater incorporation of ethnic studies, multicultural education, and bilingual education into the struggle for the goals sought by international and foreign language education (as well as the converse contribution of international and foreign language education to the goals of ethnic studies, multicultural education, and bilingual education). In the area of languages, this would involve not only addition through foreign second-language education, but also maintenance of existing non-English language skills, such as through bilingual education.

International to Intercultural

As I use the term here, intercultural refers to the interrelationship among culturally diverse individuals, groups, nations, and world areas. In this sense, international education (both area studies and global education), ethnic studies, multicultural education, foreign language education, and bilingual education are all part of the larger framework of intercultural education. Among their common concerns are:

(1) to improve interpersonal, intergroup, and international relations;

(2) to increase awareness of the impact of global and national forces, trends, and institutions on different groupings of people, including nations and ethnic groups;

(3) to reduce stereotyping and increase intergroup and international understanding;

(4) to increase comprehension of the significance of human diversity, including intragroup diversity, while at the same time recognizing underlying ethnic, national, and globe-girdling commonalities; and

(5) to improve intercultural communication.

With such explicitly-stated common concerns as a rallying point, interculturally-oriented educators can cooperate in planning, implementation, and mobilization, while at the same time preserving their special emphases. Moreover, they can all contribute to increasing the curricular examination of the historical and contemporary confluence of intranational and international diversity, including such topics as:

(1) the cross-national comparative study of ethnicity and ethnic groups in different nations and world areas, including language diversity and policy in different nations;

(2) the significance of immigration and immigrants both in the United States and around the world, including historical changes in language policies concerning immigrants;

(3) the nature and importance of transnational linkages between U.S. ethnic groups and their foreign root cultures, including the study of those root cultures, the way linkages (including language linkages) are maintained, and the changes that occur in U.S. ethnic cultures, including linguistic modifications and adaptations.

Significance of Ethnic Groups

The report recognizes the importance of ethnic groups in foreign language and international studies, recommending that "special attention should be given to encouraging ethnic and other minority-group members to enter linguistic and international studies, and to build on their existing linguistic resources so they may contribute more to American education, diplomacy, and international business." In what respects are ethnic groups such a resource? I would like to suggest at least three areas.

(1) Knowledge of languages -- Many persons in the United States, both native born and foreign born, have been raised in a non-English-speaking environment, be it another nation, an ethnic community, or a home. Their knowledge of another language is truly a major potential national resource. I stress potential, because that resource is too often treated in our society as a deficit to be eradicated. Beyond simply deploring the disappearance of "other language" skills among U.S. ethnics, as the report does, intercultural educators need to call for a national educational policy of continuously maintaining and strengthening of those skills as a personal and national resource. Squandering that resource through institutional or policy neglect is as profligate as putting a torch to our oil reserves.

(2) Cultural knowledge -- Immigrants bring with them some knowledge of the culture from which they come and often maintain close ties to their country of birth. Even many U.S.-born ethnics maintain close linkages with their foreign root cultures. However, simply living in another culture and maintaining linkages with it do not, in themselves, necessarily make one truly knowledgeable about that nation or culture. (For example, surveys have consistently demonstrated that many Americans suffer from a shocking lack of knowledge about the United States.) As with languages, knowledge based on foreign, ethnic, and transnational experiences is a potential resource which needs to be developed.

(3) Intercultural skills -- The experiences of coming from another nation and living within an ethnic community (particularly a non-English-speaking one) provide opportunities to develop intercultural skills for relating to mainstream U.S. society. Sometimes this results in persons who are particularly skillful in multicultural situations. Where such intercultural skills exist, they have the special strength of experience-based learning and can be useful when adapted to international settings.

Role of Current Programs

Along with the selective establishment of new programs, we must make better and mutually reinforcing use of existing ones. The report addresses the programmatic roles of foreign language and international studies. Linked with these are three other types of programs--bilingual education, multicultural education, and ethnic studies.

(1) Bilingual education -- Bilingual education in the United States is generally viewed and implemented as a transitional remedial program to prepare non-English-speaking children to be able to function in English. This is one proper and important role of bilingual education, as all Americans certainly need a command of English. However, if this is viewed as the only role, bilingual education becomes "subtractive" (sometimes even destructive) by not continuing to develop that vital personal skill and societal resource after the student has "succeeded" in entering mainstream English-only education. In this respect, such transitional bilingual education conflicts with one major thrust of the report ("a comprehensive language policy ought to recognize this important national resource"), limits opportunities for the individual (whose mobility and future options would be increased with multiple language skills), and works against the best interests of the nation (which badly needs such linguistically skilled people).

In addition to preparing young people to function effectively in English (which it must continue to do), bilingual education should become a national force for helping to maintain and strengthen the non-English language skills of these young people. It would benefit them by increasing their physical and career mobility. It would benefit our nation by increasing its bilingual and biliterate resources. The development of this resource is far too critical to be imposed totally on the home and community any more than educators would consider imposing on them the total responsibility for mathematics, science, or social studies education.

Moreoever, "additive" bilingual (two-language) education should be expanded at the elementary school level to include all children, while more options should be provided for third-language study at the high school and college levels. To

deny young people, of any background, the opportunity to develop dual or multiple language skills at an age when they can be most easily learned is to deny them an educational opportunity available in many other nations. To fail to develop a multilingual citizenry is to deny our nation the proper preparation for the shrinking, increasingly interrelated world of the future.

(2) Multicultural education -- State legislatures and departments of education throughout the nation increasingly are mandating kindergarten-through-twelfth-grade multicultural education. However, the gap between governmental mandate and effective implementation can be a giant one. Because multicultural education in most schools, particularly elementary schools, involves both international and ethnic content, this thrust provides an ideal place for educators with primarily international interests and those with primarily ethnic concerns to pool their efforts. We need to work together to make certain that multiculturalism pervades all subject areas, is continuous from kindergarten through twelfth grade, each year includes the valid and sensitive examination of both international and intranational diversity, and, wherever possible, explores the linkages between the two.

(3) Ethnic studies -- While integrated K-12 multicultural education should be required for all, students should also have opportunities for elective ethnic and international studies courses, beginning in high school at the latest. To develop their commonalities and be mutually reinforcing, ethnic studies courses should include the examination of the foreign aspects (heritage and contemporary linkages) of different ethnic groups' experiences, while area studies courses should examine the U.S. ethnic projections of the various foreign areas. Global education should include such themes as transnational linkages and immigration, as well as comparative ethnicity and language diversity around the world. Foreign language courses often provide additional dimensions through cultural content and could also include the analysis of the development of the target language both within and outside of the United States.

There are valid imperatives for individual ethnic studies and international studies programs and courses (including both area and global studies), particularly at the university level. There are also powerful imperatives for increasing cooperation, both internally by adding new dimensions to their own courses and research and externally by collaborating in course work, degree requirements, research, and service. In the area of degrees, for example, cooperation could take such forms as:

(1) a university-wide intercultural graduation requirement involving course work about both U.S. ethnic groups and foreign areas;

(2) a joint degree in intercultural studies, in which students explore both internal and external diversity;

(3) joint degrees in naturally related area and ethnic studies programs (such as Black and African Studies or Chicano and Latin American Studies);

(4) intercultural joint programs with professional schools (such as business, law, or public administration graduate degrees with intercultural emphases involving both ethnic groups and foreign areas); and

(5) the more effective implementation of the multicultural education requirement now mandated for teacher training institutions by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Beyond the curriculum, persons involved in ethnic and international studies could establish joint research programs, which could address such mutual interests as transnational linkages, immigration, comparative ethnicity, comparative language policies, and the impact of global changes on diverse areas and ethnic groups. In addition, ethnic and international studies programs could develop joint service dimensions, particularly in the case of universities located in communities with large immigrant populations. Such community outreach could also provide students with increased personal contact with "culturally different" people.

Continuing Education

By definition, education is continuing. Yet schools do not and cannot monopolize continuing education, as all students, all people continuously receive education outside of schools in the societal curriculum--that massive, ongoing, informal curriculum of family, peer groups, neighborhoods, churches, organizations, occupations, mass media, and other socializing forces that "educate" all of us throughout our lives. Much of this informal continuing education deals with regions of the world, foreign nations, global issues, internal diversity, ethnic groups, and the role and variations of language.

While students are in school, the societal curriculum functions as a parallel educational process. Once students complete formal schooling, the societal curriculum becomes the educational process. Therefore, for all Americans, intercultural education will inevitably go on.

Continuing intercultural education, then, should be a concern of all those dedicated to the preparation of people for living on a culturally complex globe and in a culturally diverse nation. Part of this can occur within schools through such means as special public programs and university extension courses. But to be truly effective, educators must reach beyond their own institutions.

Intercultural educators need to work closely with private ethnic organizations, language schools, and churches to assist in such areas as language maintenance and development of community cultural programs. They need to work more closely with private businesses (particularly those involved with international commerce, those serving ethnically diverse peoples, and those using a culturally diverse, heavily immigrant work force), to strengthen multicultural aspects of their inservice management, supervisorial training, and language learning. They need to work more closely with K-12 educational institutions and government agencies to strengthen intercultural and language inservice training. And they need to work more closely with the media to improve--both qualitatively and quantitatively--news coverage and interpretation of world events and ethnic groups, as well as help make more valid and balanced the depictions of ethnic groups and foreign nations in so-called "entertainment programs." In short, educators need to help make the intercultural societal curriculum more of an ally and less of an antagonist in the quest for better intercultural understanding.

Conclusion

Cooperation among foreign language, international, bilingual, multicultural,

and ethnic studies educational advocates could proceed by jointly working toward such goals as the following.

(1) At the K-12 level:

(a) continuous bilingual education for all students beginning elementary school, when their language learning and development capacities are greatest;

(b) integrated K-12 multicultural education, with both internal ethnic and external global dimensions, at all grade levels and in all subject areas; and

(c) options for additional elective study of specific foreign areas, ethnic groups, and third languages, particularly in high school.

(2) At the undergraduate level:

(a) an intercultural graduation requirement, with both international and interethnic dimensions, for all students; and

(2) joint intercultural degree programs involving ethnic and area studies units and specialists.

(3) At the professional level:

(a) intercultural emphasis programs for persons in such fields as business, law, and public administration; and

(b) improved implementation of the multicultural education requirement (both international and ethnic) in all teacher certification programs.

(4) In continuing education, cooperative efforts with:

(a) ethnic organizations and institutions to develop and strengthen language and culture maintenance programs;

(b) businesses to introduce multicultural aspects into their management training;

(c) K-12 educational institutions, from the individual school to the federal government, to provide quality language and intercultural inservice training; and

(d) the media to improve the quality and quantity of their international and ethnic coverage and depictions.

Persons involved in foreign language, international, bilingual, multicultural, and ethnic studies education need to recognize the extensive commonalities of concerns and the options for cooperative and reinforcing action. Cooperation for common purposes need not restrict individual programmatic identity nor dilute the particularistic emphases of different programs or thrusts. However, should excessive parochialism prevail among such obvious educational allies and should defense of turf or lack of vision obstruct cooperative efforts toward common goals, then all will end up losing--educators, students, and, ultimately, our nation and the world.